

Summary of Comments Received During Public Review Period

Proposition 204 Drainage Reuse Grant Program
On Farm Drainage Management and Harvesting of Salts
2013 Funding Round

Public Review Period: 6/11/13 to 6/27/13
Public Workshops: 6/11/13 (Modesto) and 6/13/13 (Fresno)
Comments Compiled: 7/2/2013 by Maggie Dutton (DWR)

Public comments on the Draft Guidelines and Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) were received during two public workshops held on the dates above. Unless quoted, the following comments are paraphrased from the original comment received. Commenters at the public workshops were encouraged to utilize the comment forms provided. Some comments were received on the comment forms, while some were verbal comments only.

Public Comments Received During Workshop 1 in Modesto

- 1) What scale of project are we looking at in terms of the salt harvesting projects?
- 2) To what extent are we required to include environmental CEQA documentation for a larger facility site, if the project is performed at a facility with other concurrent projects or impacts?
- 3) Can grant money be used to (1) prepare the CEQA documentation or (2) pay for disposal of project waste (for example, a brine waste from desalination treatment)?

Public Comments Received During Workshop 2 in Fresno

- 4) "Please clarify between point 6 and 11 under Eligibility Requirements."
Additional explanation: Example projects 6 and 11 both include discussion of utilizing plants to remove toxic elements of drainage water or for reuse. Example project 11 is considered a preferred project. Therefore, additional clarification is requested to differentiate between the two example projects.
- 5) "Please be specific about required/allowable budget items (i.e., travel, outreach, conference fees, [overhead rate, expenses,] etc.). Also, please describe overhead rates for university applicants."
- 6) "Removing '... , such as the ... for drainage reuse' might help distinguish from points 6 and 11 on page 4, Eligible Projects."
- 7) "Checklist for required document"
Additional explanation: It was requested to include in the Guidelines/PSP a checklist that provided a list of all the items required for a complete application packet.
- 8) "Page limit for each part/section"
Additional explanation: It was requested that a page limit be specified for each of the sections of the application proposal.
- 9) "Format/Template"

Additional explanation: It was requested that a template be provided or that a format be specified for how the proposal should be configured.

10) "Budget and justification requirement/limit"

Additional explanation: It was requested that more detailed information be provided on the requirements for the budget and page limit on justification section of the proposal.

Other Discussion/Comments:

11) Can drainage water mean poor quality groundwater? Can utilization of shallow poor quality groundwater count as drainage water?

12) What is the detail required for each section? Please specify the required length of the technical section of the application.

13) Can federal agencies be added to the list of eligible projects?

14) Can proposals utilize part of an approved CEQA document?

15) Can the slides of the workshop presentation be posted online?

16) Should administrative overhead be included in the budget?

17) Can funding from other agencies be used as a cost share? Are there restrictions for use of federal grants as cost share? Is only independent funding viable as a cost share?

18) The CEQA requirements add some uncertainty to the application process. How much longer is the process going to take with the CEQA requirements? When should we start working on CEQA?

Other Comments Received (via email or phone)

None